

7 February 1980

MEMORANDUM FOR: Executive Officer  
Office of Medical Services

FROM : [REDACTED] Ph.D.  
Chief, Psychological Services Staff  
Office of Medical Services

SUBJECT : PSS Response to the Draft IG Report  
on Medical Processing (Section K)  
and on SET Testing (Section F)

1. We fully concur with the statement made on page 99 that PSS "...is overworked..." The statement that testing increased from FY 78 to FY 79 "...about 100%..." is correct for applicants only. The level of testing for employees is not included in this figure. Intensive assessments were 61% greater in FY 79 than in FY 78, not 72% greater as stated on page 99.

2. The statement of PSS personnel strength made on page 100 is incorrect. The PSS Assessment Branch contains six full-time assessment psychologists, one of whom is female, and one 30-hr. per week assessment psychologist who is female. The PSS Research Branch contains three full-time research psychologists and is actively recruiting a fourth. The three full-time research psychologists currently on board are male. The Research Branch also has a 30-hr. per week research psychologist who is female. Research also has three full-time associate research psychologists, all of whom are female. The statement that the DCI decided in 1978 "...to search for a black psychologist..." is news to us. If this is true, no one in PSS, or OMS for that matter, was ever told about this to the best of my knowledge.

3. The statement that there "...is no clear-cut delineation of roles between OMS' Psychiatric Division and Psychological Services Staff..." is totally naive and incorrect. The statement to the effect that PD and PSS evaluate essentially the same criteria in applicants is

SUBJECT: PSS Response to the Draft IG Report on Medical Processing (Section K) and on SET Testing (Section F)

misleading and reflects on the part of the inspectors a gross misunderstanding of the differences between psychology and psychiatry. Their statement that the "...distinction between the roles of the two units is not clear..." confirms this. As a result, we see no reason for Recommendation 24 presented on page 101 and suggest that this recommendation be dropped.

4. We take no position on the suggestion made on pages 111-114 that the SET test be validated specifically for Agency employees. The SET test has a considerable amount of validation work standing behind it, and we see little difference between clerical work in the Agency and the clerical work tasks on which the test was originally developed (and validated). If PSS is asked to conduct a validation study of the SET test, we would be happy to oblige, workload permitting. This, however, would have to receive low priority because of the heavy project load currently faced by our Research Branch. SECRET

